



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the alleged murder of Somerville in prison (p. 91), and the likelihood of Phelippes's interpolations of Babington's letter (pp. 120-121). Moreover, he certainly exaggerates the share of the Jesuits in sending the Armada (p. 139) and in the dismissal of Clarendon (p. 250), while any careful student of James I. and Charles II. would reject his hasty and sweeping characterizations of those monarchs (pp. 128, 185, 186, 218) as contrary to fact. Such head-lines as "Whitewashing Assassination" (p. 67), "Assassination 'by Poison or by Steel'" (p. 115), "Piety, Blood, and Murder" (p. 119) suggest sensational journalism, and will cause, not only scholars, but average readers to wag their heads. One wonders what is meant by "'Venerable' Saint" (p. 173), and whether beatification necessarily involves ultimate canonization (p. 199). Also it is somewhat of a shock to see Parkman called "the Canadian historian" (p. 329). One regrets to see a book not without historical merit disfigured by acrid displays of feeling, and queries whether the author would not have better served his purpose by letting the facts speak for themselves, and by omitting to lug in modern applications by the ears.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Parliamentary England: the Evolution of the Cabinet System.* By

EDWARD JENKS, M.A., Reader in English Law in the University of Oxford. [Story of the Nations Series.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. xix, 441.)

IN this book Mr. Jenks has given us a history of all important parliamentary proceedings since the Restoration, together with such other portions of the history of England as are necessary to an understanding of these Parliamentary transactions. The first title is perhaps more appropriate than the second, for while the evolution of the cabinet system is carefully traced, quite as many pages are devoted to the legislation and administration of the past two centuries as to the development of the machinery of legislation and administration. Indeed, the most important criticism that can be made upon the book is that while the development of the cabinet system is prominent, there are, considering the subtitle, so many diversions that it is at times difficult to keep the thread of the narrative. This fault is in part remedied in the last chapter, which contains an admirable summary of the process of evolution. While there is nothing new in this work, a large number of facts in constitutional and political history are presented in orderly fashion, and the result is most readable.

Mr. Jenks considers (pp. 92-93) that the only absolutely essential features of the cabinet system are (1) that the cabinet should be composed mainly, if not wholly, of the actual occupants of great political offices; (2) that the supreme control of the national administration should be in the hands of the cabinet. Other features, such as the solidarity of the cabinet, its ability to command a majority in the House

of Commons, and the absence of the sovereign from its meetings, he regards as important but not essential. It is of course possible to conceive of a system of cabinet government in which these features should be lacking, but it would not be the English cabinet system, nor is it easy to see how such a government could solve the problem of combining popularity with efficiency. Like other writers Mr. Jenks rejects Macaulay's theory that the cabinet system was adopted between 1692 and 1695, when the famous Whig Junto came into power. If an exact date must be fixed for the beginning of the new order, he thinks that the year 1705, when the Tory Marlborough-Godolphin ministry was transformed into the Whig Marlborough-Godolphin ministry, has stronger claims than any date which precedes it. But almost as strong an argument can be made against 1705 as against 1692-1695. Both marked stages in the development — that is all. Yet although Mr. Jenks would put the beginnings of cabinet government later than some authorities have done, even in the Cabal Ministry of Charles II. he sees one feature of the coming system which historians generally have failed to recognize. "In dismissing Clarendon and admitting the Cabal to office," he tells us, "he [Charles] was really losing a servant and gaining a master. . . . however divided amongst themselves, however innocent of principle, the new Ministers resembled a modern Cabinet in this important fact — that they hoped to govern England according to their own views, and not according to the views of the King" (p. 24).

The really valuable chapter is the last one, entitled "History and Criticism". Here the results of the introduction of the cabinet system are summed up as (1) the increase in the popularity and prestige of the crown; (2) the unity which has been given to political organs; (3) the spirit of leniency which has come over British politics in the last century and a half; (4) the fact that the government of England has become a government by persuasion. Attention has been called to these points before, but the reviewer does not remember having seen before so adequate an exposition of the effect of the increased popularity of the crown, as resulting from the cabinet system, upon the unity of the empire. "For", Mr. Jenks says, "if it is a good thing that the Crown should be popular in Great Britain, it is absolutely essential, if the unity of the Empire is to be preserved, that the Crown should be popular in the Greater Britain beyond the seas. . . . There is but one King in all the British Empire; there are many Parliaments. . . . So far as institutions are a bond, it is, in fact, the popularity of the Crown, and not the popularity of the British Parliament, which holds the Empire together; and it is the legal position of the Crown, as the supreme organ of political activity, which enables the Empire to speak with a single voice" (pp. 403-405).

Mr. Jenks points out that inasmuch as the cabinet system is a system of government by persuasion, "The man of great force of character, tenaciously bent on carrying out a distant object of supreme importance, finds no ostensible place in it" (p. 423); that there is no room in the cabinet for a Bismarck or a Cavour. Whether this is a defect or not he

does not discuss at length, but he calls attention to the fact that whereas under the old system the minister had both to find out the ideas and to apply them, under the present arrangement he is more and more the mere exponent and enforcer of ideas furnished to him from without. Therefore the English Bismarcks and Cavours may do more effective work outside the cabinet than in it.

Exception may perhaps be taken to the statement on page 408 that "never, since the days of George I., has there been a quarrel between Parliament and the Crown, save for the few brief months at the beginning of 1784". In 1757 the country was for three months without a government because George II. was unwilling to accept the ministers whom Parliament finally succeeded in forcing upon him.

MARY TAYLOR BLAUVELT.

*The Unreformed House of Commons: Parliamentary Representation before 1832.* By EDWARD PORRITT, assisted by ANNIE G. PORRITT. Vol. I., England and Wales; Vol. II., Scotland and Ireland. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxi, 623; xiv, 584.)

THE title of these two large volumes, containing about half a million words, is too modest. The book is really an elaborate history of the representation of the Commons in the three kingdoms, including not merely the character of the various franchises, but the whole scheme of the relations between members of Parliament and their constituents. Constitutional histories dealing with the legal aspects of such questions we have in abundance; social and political histories are also sufficiently numerous, but nowhere else is there to be found in one work so full an account of the membership of the House of Commons, associated with adequate glimpses of social environment. On the constitutional side Mr. Porritt's work will take its place beside Stubbs and May, and on the social with Lecky in regard to England and Ireland, and with Burton in regard to Scotland. These volumes are only part of what he promises. He intends to complete the work with a history of Parliamentary reform from the time of Elizabeth to the Redistribution Bill of 1885.

Mr. Porritt is an Englishman who has carried on the chief portion of his studies in the United States and in Canada. He bears testimony to the adequacy of cisatlantic libraries for such studies, and by residence under different types of representative institutions he has cultivated a certain detachment of mind, which is however not yet complete. Stubbs boasted that no one could tell from his writings whether he was a Radical or a Tory. Mr. Porritt champions democracy. There is no evidence of profound learning in regard to the earlier history of representative institutions. His attention is fixed chiefly on the last three centuries, but in regard to these his work is very thorough, and, among other things, he appears to have gone through the whole of the eighty-odd volumes of the *House of Commons Journals*. In addition to the standard authorities